



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/622,353	09/12/2000	John A. Arbuckle	0457-PCT-US	4766

7590 03/18/2004

David B Ran
7100 N W 62nd Avenue
Darwin Building
Johnston, IA 50131

EXAMINER

TUNG, JOYCE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1637

DATE MAILED: 03/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/622,353

Applicant(s)

ARBUCKLE ET AL.

Examiner

Joyce Tung

Art Unit

1637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 December 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Based upon the response filed 12/19/2003, the claims 1-21 are pending.

1. Applicant's arguments filed 12/19/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive as the reasons set forth as follows.

The response filed 12/19/2003 explains how one is to establish a prima facie case of obviousness and what is the motivation to combine prior art references. However, the response does not provide evidence or arguments why the Office action does not establish a prima facie case and what is the difference between the prior art and the instant invention.

The response also argues that the examiner fails to provide motivation to combine the prior art. The motivation to combine combines from the prior art. Kindiger et al. disclose the transposable element termed mutator "Mu" which is particularly active and has been used successfully to locate the position of genes as well as providing a marker for their isolation (See column 12, lines 46-49). Therefore, it would have been prima facie obvious to carry out the method of the identification and isolation of a genetic sequence which is disrupted by a transposable element flanking the genetic sequence associated with a mutant phenotype by using the primer which hybridizes to the transposable element sequence in a genetic sequence. Thus, the rejections are maintained and restated as follows.

2. Claims 1, 4-7, 9-13, and 15-21 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindemann et al. (5,958,738, issued 9/1999) in view of Kindiger et al. (5,710,367, issued 1/1998).

Lindemann et al. disclose a method for obtaining polynucleotides comprising sequences which differ between two populations of DNA (See the Abstract) involving two polynucleotide

populations fragmented which are attached an oligonucleotide comprising nested primer binding sites or the complements thereof in which the primer binding sites comprising an outermost primer binding site, an innermost primer binding site and at least one more internal primer binding site between to produce marked sample and control sample (See column 10, lines 26-48). The teachings of Lindemann et al. suggest that the primer is nested (See the recited in step (e) of claim 1 and step (d) of claim 15). Lindemann et al. also disclose that the method is for the identification and isolation of polynucleotides comprising nucleic acid sequences present in a first (sample) cell, cell type, or cell population that are not present in one or more other cells or cell populations. Such polynucleotide is identified as "unique fragments" which may be obtained as a result of differences in sequence content, such as insertion or deletion (See column 5, lines 60-67 to column 6, lines 1-3).

Lindemann et al. do not disclose using an oligonucleotide primer which hybridizes under stringent hybridization conditions to a transposable element in a genetic sequence.

Kindiger et al. disclose that the invention is for using the genetic elements for producing true breeding plant progeny and nucleic acid sequences and is useful for identifying the genetic elements (See column 1, lines 10-15). The invention discloses the use of transposable element systems to isolate the A and N gene (See column 12, lines 41-46). One transposable element termed mutator "Mu" is particularly active and has been used successfully to locate the position of genes as well as providing a marker for their isolation (See column 12, lines 46-50). The A and N gene can be isolated and cloned via the 220 bp terminal inverted repeat "flag" used to identify a Mu insertion. The Mu probe is used to identify the mutant for the gene (See column 13, lines 9-18).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention would have been motivated to modify the method of Lindemann et al. by applying the Kindiger et al.'s primer which hybridizes to the transposable element for the identification and isolation of a genetic

Art Unit: 1637

sequence which is disrupted by a transposable element flanking the genetic sequence associated with a mutant phenotype. Kindiger et al. disclose that the transposable element termed mutator "Mu" is particularly active and has been used successfully to locate the position of genes as well as providing a marker for their isolation (See column 12, lines 46-49). It would have been prima facie obvious to carry out the method of the identification and isolation of a genetic sequence which is disrupted by a transposable element flanking the genetic sequence associated with a mutant phenotype by using the primer which hybridizes to the transposable element sequence in a genetic sequence.

3. Claims 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindemann et al. (5,958,738, issued 9/1999) in view of Kindiger et al. (5,710,367, issued 1/1998) as applied to claims 1, 4-7, 9-13, and 15-21 above, and further in view of Schunable et al. (5,684,242, issued 11/1997).

The teachings and suggestions of Lindemann et al and Kindiger et al. are set forth in section 4 above.

Lindemann et al. do not disclose using cosegregation analysis to isolate DNA amplification product that cosegregates with the mutant phenotype.

Schunable et al. disclose a method for the production of hybrid seed (See column 5, lines 31-39). The plant used is from maize (See column 8, lines 55-58). Cosegregation analysis was performed to isolate the DNA amplified product that cosegregates with the mutant phenotype (See column 19, lines 33-43).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply the cosegregation analysis of Schunable et al. to the method suggested by the combination of Lindemann et al. in view of Kindiger et al. to identify and isolate of a genetic sequence flanking the genetic sequence associated with a mutant phenotype. The method of Schunable et al. was involved using cosegregation analysis in which the location of insertion was clearly marked (See column

Art Unit: 1637

20, lines 14-16). Thus, it would have been prima facie obvious to carry out the method of the identification and isolation of a genetic sequence which is disrupted by a transposable element flanking the genetic sequence associated with a mutant phenotype with using cosegregation analysis.

4. Claims 3 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindemann et al. (5,958,738, issued 9/1999) in view of (Kindiger et al. (5,710,367, issued 1/1998) as applied to claims 1, 4-7, 9-13, and 15-21 above, and further in view of Halverson et al. (5,707,809, issued 1/1998).

The teachings and suggestions of Lindemann et al. are set forth in section 4 above.

Lindemann et al do not teach using bulked segregant analysis to isolate the amplified products and the labeled primer.

Halverson et al. disclose a method for sex identification involving bulked segregant analysis (See column 21, lines 23-26) and that the primer used is joined to a label (See column 38, lines 23-25).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention would have been motivated to apply the bulked segregant analysis of Halverson et al. to the method suggested by the combination of Lindemann et al. in view of Kindizer et al. in order to identify and isolate of a genetic sequence flanking the genetic sequence associated with a mutant phenotype. Halverson et al. states that the bulked segregant analysis is simple, accurate and efficient (See column 25, lines 17-20). It would have been prima facie obvious to carry out the method of the identification and isolation of a genetic sequence which is disrupted by a transposable element flanking the genetic sequence associated with a mutant phenotype using the bulked segregant analysis of Halverson et al..

Summary

5. No claims are allowable.

Art Unit: 1637

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joyce Tung whose telephone number is (703) 305-7112. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM-4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached at (703) 308-1119 on Monday-Friday from 10:00 AM-6:00 PM.

Any inquiries of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Chemical/Matrix receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

8. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Art Unit 1637 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal


Application/Control Number: 09/622,353

Page 7

Art Unit: 1637

Mall 1 using (703) 305-3014 or 308-4242. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989).

Joyce Tung *JT*
March 12, 2004


ETHAN WHISENANT
PRIMARY EXAMINER